



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,810	10/30/2003	Warren E. Baxley	199-0248US-C	9575
29855 7590 10/29/2008 WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070				
EXAMINER PASIA, REDENTOR M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2416				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,810

Applicant(s)

BAXLEY ET AL.

Examiner

REDECTOR M. PASIA

Art Unit

2416

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-10, 12-15 and 32-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-10, 12-15 and 32-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on July 11, 2008 has been entered. No claims have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 3-10, 12-15, 32-39 are still pending in this application, with claims 6, 7 and 35 being independent.

Terminal Disclaimer

2. The terminal disclaimer filed on July 11, 2008 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US Patent 6,646,997 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 3-5, 7-10, 12-15 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 7 shows the claim limitation, "said packet-switched conferencing system" in line 9-10. The Examiner has reviewed the previously submitted claims (dated January 29, 2004), and has compared the previous set of claims to the current set of claims (dated July 11, 2008) and has determined that the word "**component**" is missing from claim limitation stated above.

4. Instead of "said packet-switched conferencing system" as shown in line 9-10, the claim limitation must be revised to "said packet-switched conferencing system component" since Applicant's Attorney has expressed that claim 7 is not amended and is previously submitted. Also, with respect to the Applicant's Attorney's remarks that claim 7 as being not amended, the

Examiner has included, "said packet-switched conferencing system component" in the rejection of the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 3, 7, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel).

As to claim 7, Detampel shows a method for adding an additional endpoint to an audio conference in a purely packet-switched audio conferencing system (Figure 1; abstract; method for setting up an on-demand conference call in a telecommunications system), said method comprising:

placing a call from an endpoint (figure 6, step 601, caller dials) to a packet-switched conferencing system component (Figure 3, CACS 301),

said call indicating an audio conference (Figure 6, step 601; col. 9, lines 61-62, caller dials a unique on-demand conference number);

selecting, in a conference allocation and control system (Figure 1, CACS 103; Figure 3, CACS 301) in said audio conferencing system (figure 1, system 10), a multiple control unit (Figure 1; one of bridge servers 101a-101n) to host said audio conference (col. 5, lines 36-38,

when an on-demand conference call request comes in, the CACS determines which bridge servers 101 have sufficient availability of ports to handle the on-demand conference call; col. 9, lines 61-66; the steps take place as described above to select the bridge server 101 having enough ports available for the subscriber's maximum call);

initiating a call request from said selected multiple control unit (Figure 1, bridge 101a-n) to said packet-switched conferencing system component (Figure 3, Bridge Manager 310 in CACS 301), said call request indicating said additional endpoint (col. 10, lines 52-67; as each participant joins the conference, a participant join message is sent via BAPI module 303 and the bridge manager 310 (BAPI module 303 and bridge manager 310 are part of CACS).);

returning a destination address (col. 8, line 33; ONNET translation number) from said packet-switched conferencing system component to said selected multiple control unit (col. 8, lines 14-55; The CACS call router module 302 receives a routing request from over network 109 from the SCP pair 105. The CACS 103 selects a bridge server 101 with enough available capacity to handle the maximum number of conference participants allowed by the service (e.g., 20), allocates the capacity, and returns routing instructions in terms of a POTS or ONNET translation number through the SCP pair 105. Each bridge server 101 would have a unique POTS or ONNET translation number for every simultaneous conference allowed on the bridge.), said destination address corresponding to said additional endpoint (col. 8, line 14-55; for example, if the on-demand service had a maximum participant capacity of 20, each bridge server would need at least 12 (240 ports/20 participants per conference) unique POTS or ONNET translation numbers).

establishing a point-to-point call (Examiner notes that this claim limitation interpreted to be the same as being "a connection") from said multiple control unit to said additional endpoint based on said destination address thereby bringing said additional endpoint into said audio conference (col. 8, lines 14-55; the CACS 103 would note which translation number is currently "assigned" to which N00 number (unique number dialed by participant) so that a translation number can be tied to the dialed N00 number which can be tied to a participant which can be tied to the currently authorized participant/subscriber passcode. The SCP pair 105 encapsulates the routing instructions with an SS7 TCAP message and returns appropriate routing instructions via the SS7 network 106 to the originating service point 402. The on-demand call is routed via the PSTN 102 to the selected bridge server 101.).

As to claim 3, Detampel shows that the step of placing a call, links said endpoint (figure 1, user in network 106, 102; Figure 4, user 401-n) Figure 2 to said packet-switched conferencing system component (Figures 1, 4, CACS 103) through said packet-switched audio conferencing system (Figures 1, 4, 6; col. 8, lines 14-55).

As to claim 12, Detampel further shows the step of dynamically routing an operator voice path to service (Examiner interprets this claim limitation as being the same as having an operator being able to service/handle components/servers in a packet switched network; col. 6, lines 58-62, shows the Operator Interface module 305 is the application program interface to the operator/maintenance stations 107, and handles operator request queue management, registration for operator-monitored bridge events, and operator updates to the subscriber database 104; Figure 6, col. 10, lines 14-67; shows the operator functions when an invalid passcode/PIN was supplied, however, for example purposes, the operator station is shown to interact with bridge

101.; col. 4, lines 65-67; shows operator/maintenance stations 107 is connected to CACS through network 109 to provide operator interaction with system 10, that further includes multiple bridge servers 101a-n) multiple control units (Figure 1, bridge servers 101a-n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 6, 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Petrunka et al. (US 6,122,364; hereinafter Petrunka).

As to claim 6, Detampel shows a method of establishing an audio conference in an audio conferencing system (abstract; method for setting up an on-demand conference call in a telecommunications system), the method comprising:

initiating a call from an endpoint to said audio conferencing system (Figure 6, step 601, caller dials), said call indicating said audio conference (Figure 6, step 601 col. 9, lines 61-62, caller dials a unique on-demand conference number);

selecting, in a conference allocation and control system (Figure 1, conference allocation and control system, CACS 103) in said audio conferencing system (figure 1, system 10), a multiple control unit (Figure 1; bridge server 101a-101n) to host said audio conference (col. 5, lines 36-38, when an on-demand conference call request comes in, the CACS 103 determines

which bridge servers 101 have sufficient availability of ports to handle the on-demand conference call; col. 9, lines 61-66; the steps take place as described above to select the bridge server 101 having enough ports available for the subscriber's maximum call);

determining in said conference allocation and control system whether the call from said endpoint contains adequate information to establish said audio conference (Figure 6, steps 605-607, 617-619, prompting by CACS for passcode/PIN from user and validating the passcode/PIN);

responding from conference allocation and control system to said endpoint with routing instructions when there is inadequate information to establish said audio conference (Figure 6, steps 605-607; col. 10, lines 14-23, 52-67, after three incorrect attempts to enter the passcode/PIN, the caller is routed (not shown in FIG. 6) to an operator station 107 or a wrong passcode/PIN recording is played). Detampel further shows adequate information to establish said audio conference (Figure 6, 605-607) and said selected multiple control unit (Figure 1, bridge server 101a-n; col. 5, line 29-45, when an on-demand conference call request comes in, the CACS 103 determines which bridge servers 101 have sufficient availability of ports to handle the on-demand conference call).

Detampel does not specifically show an interactive voice response server and the steps of: connecting said endpoint to said interactive voice response server when there is inadequate information to route said call; gathering in said interactive voice response server, after connecting said endpoint to said interactive voice response server, said adequate information to establish said audio conference; and transferring said endpoint from said interactive voice

response server to said selected multiple control unit after said interactive voice response server gathers said adequate information.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitations are well-established in the art as evidenced by Petrunka. Specifically, Petrunka shows an interactive voice response server (Figure 1, IVR 1130) and the steps of:

connecting said endpoint to said interactive voice response server when there is inadequate information to route said call (Figure 4, steps 4010-4040);

gathering in said interactive voice response server (Figure 4, step 4050), after connecting said endpoint to said interactive voice response server (Figure 4, steps 4010-4040), said adequate information (Figure 4, step 4050, additional information); and

transferring said endpoint from said interactive voice response server after said interactive voice response server gathers said adequate information (Figure 4, steps 4050 to 4070; shows that when additional information is verified, the high level switch (which includes the IVR and the automatic call distribution (ACD) server) directs the call to VoIP server).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and given the well-established teaching of Petrunka, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Detampel as taught by Petrunka, in order to permit agents to locate anywhere and eliminate the requirement for an additional data path, and/or special circuitry (col. 1, lines 63-65).

As to claim 32, modified Detampel shows that said selecting said multiple control unit comprises:

selecting in said conference allocation and control system a first multiple control unit to host said audio conference (Detampel: Figure 6, steps 601-602; col. 9, lines 61-67; on-demand conference begins 600 when the caller dials in the unique on-demand number 601. The steps take place as described above to select the bridge server 101 having enough ports available for the subscriber's maximum call.) when said audio conference is inactive (Detampel: col. 9, lines 61-67; a decision is made as to whether the conference has begun 602).

As to claim 33, modified Detampel shows the step of selecting in said conference allocation and control system a second multiple control unit to host said audio conference when said audio conference is active (Detampel: Figure 6, shows that when a user dials the designated number, step 602 checks if the conference has begun and allows the caller to connect to the conference if the caller provides adequate information; Figure 5, shows the method of selecting which bridge (Detampel: Figure 1, bridge servers 101a-n) would have enough resources to handle a caller/subscriber; col. 8, line 14 to col. 9, line 20.).

As to claim 34, modified Detampel shows the steps of responding from said conference allocation and control system to said endpoint with queried routing instructions, said queried routing instructions indicating said selected multiple control unit (Detampel; col. 8, line 14-55; The CACS call router module 302 receives a routing request from over network 109 from the SCP pair 105. The CACS 103 selects a bridge server 101 with enough available capacity to handle the maximum number of conference participants allowed by the service (e.g., 20), allocates the capacity, and returns routing instructions in terms of a POTS or ONNET translation number through the SCP pair 105. Each bridge server 101 would have a unique POTS or ONNET translation number for every simultaneous conference allowed on the bridge.).

As to claim 35, this claim is rejected using the same reasoning set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

As to claim 36, modified Detampel shows the step of selecting, in a conference allocation and control system (Detampel: Figure 1, conference allocation and control system, CACS 103) in said audio conferencing system (Detampel: figure 1, system 10), a multiple control unit (Detampel: Figure 1; bridge server 101a-101n) to host said audio conference (Detampel: col. 5, lines 29-45, when an on-demand conference call request comes in, the CACS 103 determines which bridge servers 101 have sufficient availability of ports to handle the on-demand conference call; col. 9, lines 61-67; the steps take place as described above to select the bridge server 101 having enough ports available for the subscriber's maximum call).

As to claim 37, Detampel further shows the step of dynamically routing an operator voice path to service (Examiner interprets this claim limitation as being the same as having an operator being able to service/handle components/servers in a packet switched network; col. 6, lines 58-62, shows the Operator Interface module 305 is the application program interface to the operator/maintenance stations 107, and handles operator request queue management, registration for operator-monitored bridge events, and operator updates to the subscriber database 104; Figure 6, col. 10, lines 14-67; shows the operator functions when an invalid passcode/PIN was supplied, however, for example purposes, the operator station is shown to interact with bridge 101.; col. 4, lines 65-67; shows operator/maintenance stations 107 is connected to CACS through network 109 to provide operator interaction with system 10, that further includes multiple bridge servers 101a-n) multiple control units (Figure 1, bridge servers 101a-n).

9. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Thomas (US 6,421,339 B1; hereinafter Thomas).

As to claim 4, Detampel shows all of the elements except a location found signal indicating the selected multiple control unit.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Thomas. Specifically, Thomas shows a location found signal indicating the selected multiple control unit (Figure 3, col. 5, lines 25-30; gatekeeper GK 14 may screen or otherwise filter the data received in the LCF message from GK 44 and then send a LCF to the requester or calling endpoint. As will be obvious to network designers, the data returned to the calling party may be limited so that calls must be routed through the home gatekeeper rather than giving the calling endpoint enough data to place a call directly to a roaming user).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Thomas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Thomas, in order to allow the gatekeeper to monitor the contents of all call received by given users (col. 5, lines 32-33).

As to claim 5, Detampel shows all of the elements except a location request signal.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Thomas. Specifically, Thomas shows a location request signal (Figure 3, LRQ).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Thomas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Thomas, in order to allow the gatekeeper to monitor the contents of all call received by given users (col. 5, lines 32-33).

10. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Jurkevics et al. (US 5,978,463; hereinafter Jurkevics).

As to claim 8, Detampel shows all of the elements except supporting full service audio conferencing using a reservation system and a call agent.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Jurkevics. Specifically, Jurkevics shows full service audio conferencing (Figures 2-4; abstract, audio conferencing system) using a reservation system (Figure 4, Autoscheduler 28) and a call agent (Figure 1, client 10, Figure 4, Client program 20 running on Client 10).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Jurkevics, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Jurkevics, in order to provide a substantially less labor intensive approach in audio conference scheduling (col. 3, lines 16-20).

As to claim 9, modified Detampel shows that the reservation system and the call agent are tightly integrated (Jurkevics: Figure 4-5, shows the integration of the automatic scheduling system with the client program in scheduling a conference; col. 5, lines 33-48; shows different levels of service, unattended service (no agent attending the audio conference), standard level, and premiere level).

As to claim 10, modified Detampel shows that the reservation system and the call agent are loosely integrated (Jurkevics: Figure 4-5, shows the integration of the automatic scheduling system with the client program in scheduling a conference; col. 5, lines 33-48; shows different levels of service, unattended service (no agent attending the audio conference), standard level, and premiere level).

11. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Semaan (US 5,680,392; hereinafter Semaan).

As to claim 13, Detampel shows all of the elements except the step of renegotiating the destination of a voice path to move an audio conference participant from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Semaan. Specifically, Semaan shows the step of renegotiating the destination of a voice path to move an audio conference participant from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit (Figure 2, 5; col. 11, lines 18-25; shows that if a user should wish to establish a conference with conferees who would be handled by the reservation controller of another domain, the bridge controller would pass the reservation request information onto the reservation request channel of the other reservation domain so that the appropriate reservation controller in the other domain could address the request; Figure 2 and 5, shows that each reservation controller is related to an MCU).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Semaan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Semaan, in order to provide the possibility of allowing different MCUs and reservation controllers (of different companies), to interact with each other and share information regarding requests for reservations (col. 5, lines 29-37).

As to claim 14, Detampel shows all of the elements except the step of moving said audio conference from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Semaan. Specifically, Semaan shows the step of moving said audio conference (Figure 2, 5; col. 11, lines 18-25; shows that if a user should wish to establish a conference with conferees who would be handled by the reservation controller of another domain, the bridge controller would pass the reservation request information onto the reservation request channel of the other reservation domain so that the appropriate reservation controller in the other domain could address the request; Figure 2 and 5, shows that each reservation controller is related to an MCU) from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit (Examiner notes that there is a change in reservation controllers, there is also a change in MCUs).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Semaan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Semaan, in order to provide the possibility of allowing different MCUs and reservation controllers (of different companies), to

interact with each other and share information regarding requests for reservations (col. 5, lines 29-37).

12. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Semaan (US 5,680,392; hereinafter Semaan) in further view of Rosenberg et al. (US 2005/0165894 A1; hereinafter Rosenberg).

As to claim 15, Detampel shows selected multiple control unit (Figure 1, bridge server 101a-n). However, Detampel does not explicitly show the steps of providing said audio conference to a streaming protocol server from said selected multiple control unit; connecting a passive participant to said streaming protocol server; and broadcasting said audio conference from said streaming protocol server to a said passive participant.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Semaan. Specifically, Semaan shows the steps of providing said audio conference to a reservation controller from said selected multiple control unit (Figure 2, 5; col. 11, lines 18-25; shows that if a user should wish to establish a conference with conferees who would be handled by the reservation controller of another domain, the bridge controller would pass the reservation request information onto the reservation request channel of the other reservation domain so that the appropriate reservation controller in the other domain could address the request; Figure 2 and 5, shows that each reservation controller is related to an MCU);

connecting a passive participant to said reservation controller (col. 11, lines 18-25; col. 5, lines 20-29; if users 112c, 112e, 112f, 112g, 112h, and 112j should wish to participate in a multimedia conference, the services of the four different MCUs 126a-126d will be required.

Thus, the two reservation controllers 130a, 130b must be contacted to reserve appropriate access and processing of the MCUs.); and

broadcasting said audio conference from said reservation controller to a said passive participant (col. 8, line 65 to col. 9, line 9; shows that the conference mode includes broadcast monologue and broadcast dialogue).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Semaan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Semaan, in order to provide the possibility of allowing different MCUs and reservation controllers (of different companies), to interact with each other and share information regarding requests for reservations (col. 5, lines 29-37).

Even though modified Detampel shows that the conference is held by the respective reservation controller (along with proper MCU), however, modified Detampel does not explicitly show that the conference is being provided to a streaming protocol server.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Rosenberg. Specifically, Rosenberg shows a streaming protocol server (Par. 0168; a conference participant can invite a SIP-speaking RTSP server into an existing conference, so as to appear as just another conference participant. Alternatively, for multicast conferences, an RTSP server can simply be given the same session description as was used for invitations).

In view of the above, having the system of Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Rosenberg, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the method of Detampel as taught by Rosenberg, in order to provide one or more relatively advanced telephony services (Par. 0015).

13. Claims 38-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detampel, Jr. et al (US 5,995,608; hereinafter Detampel) in view of Petrunka et al. (US 6,122,364; hereinafter Petrunka) in further view of Semaan (US 5,680,392; hereinafter Semaan).

As to claim 38, modified Detampel shows all of the elements except the step of renegotiating the destination of a voice path to move an audio conference participant from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Semaan. Specifically, Semaan shows the step of renegotiating the destination of a voice path to move an audio conference participant from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit (Figure 2, 5; col. 11, lines 18-25; shows that if a user should wish to establish a conference with conferees who would be handled by the reservation controller of another domain, the bridge controller would pass the reservation request information onto the reservation request channel of the other reservation domain so that the appropriate reservation controller in the other domain could address the request; Figure 2 and 5, shows that each reservation controller is related to an MCU).

In view of the above, having the system of modified Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Semaan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of modified Detampel as taught by Semaan, in order to provide the possibility of allowing different MCUs and reservation controllers (of

different companies), to interact with each other and share information regarding requests for reservations (col. 5, lines 29-37).

As to claim 39, modified Detampel shows all of the elements except the step of moving said audio conference from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit.

However, the above-mentioned claim limitation is well-established in the art as evidenced by Semaan. Specifically, Semaan shows the step of moving said audio conference (Figure 2, 5; col. 11, lines 18-25; shows that if a user should wish to establish a conference with conferees who would be handled by the reservation controller of another domain, the bridge controller would pass the reservation request information onto the reservation request channel of the other reservation domain so that the appropriate reservation controller in the other domain could address the request; Figure 2 and 5, shows that each reservation controller is related to an MCU) from said selected multiple control unit to a second multiple control unit (Examiner notes that there is a change in reservation controllers, there is also a change in MCUs).

In view of the above, having the system of modified Detampel and then given the well-established teaching of Semaan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of modified Detampel as taught by Semaan, in order to provide the possibility of allowing different MCUs and reservation controllers (of different companies), to interact with each other and share information regarding requests for reservations (col. 5, lines 29-37).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments, see Applicant' Remarks, filed July 11, 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 6, 32-36 under Detampel (US 2001/0002927) in view of Petrunka (US 6,122,364) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Detampel (US 5,995,608) in view of Petrunka (US 6,122,364).

Also, as to Applicant's arguments relating to independent claim 7 as being anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Detampel (US 2001/0002927), the Examiner has re-written the rejection of independent claim 7 (and corresponding claims), as being anticipated by Detampel (US 5,995,608). Since the Applicant' Attorney has presented arguments along in relation to the previous rejection, the Examiner will address the arguments since both Detampel references are similar systems.

Applicant's attorney argues that Detampel reference falls squarely into the prior art (specifically with the use of SS7). Specifically, Applicant's Attorney argues that Detampel is silent with regards to the bridge server 101a-101n being able to "initiate a call request" and establishing a point-to-point call from said multiple control unit to said additional endpoint...thereby bringing said additional endpoint into said audio conference."

The Examiner respectfully comments that the Detampel reference still applies to the given claim language presented since the presented claim language does not specifically show what type of network is being utilized by the multiple control units (i.e. not limited to non-SS7 networks). The Examiner has expressed his views with the broadest reasonable interpretations about the claim limitations presented in claim 7 as shown in the rejections above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REDENTOR M. PASIA whose telephone number is (571)272-9745. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am to 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Aung Moe can be reached on (571)272-7314. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aung S. Moe/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416

/Redentor M Pasia/
Examiner, Art Unit 2416